

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/782,084	02/14/2001	Tadashi Ohashi	1341.1080 (ЉН)	9826
21171	7590 05/28/2002			
STAAS & HALSEY LLP 700 11TH STREET, NW			EXAMINER	
			LEE, SEUNG H	
SUITE 500 WASHINGTON, DC 20001				
WASHINGI	ON, DC 20001		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2876	
			DATE MAIL ED: 05/28/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/782,084	OHASHI, TADASHI			
	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Seung H Lee	2876			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cov r sheet with the c	orrespondence addi	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 10 May 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.					
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]					
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverset, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of the period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). 	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the lan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. S	ee MPEP		
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extending the period that the pe	sion and the corresponding amount of the d statutory period for reply originally set in	efee. The appropriate ext the final Office action; or	ension fee under (2) as set forth in		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	ecause:				
(a) \square they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE:					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).					
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: So		sidered but does NC	OT place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w	nt(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b vould be rejected is provided bel	o) will be entered ow or appended.	and an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:				
Claim(s) allowed: None.					
Claim(s) objected to: None.					
Claim(s) rejected: 1-10.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	s a)□ approved or b)□ disap	proved by the Exan	niner.		
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).		7		
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>		August	7		
	•	MICHAEL G. SURERVISORY PATEN TECHNOLOGY CEN	T Examiner		

Continuation Sh t (PTO-303) 009/782,084

Continuation of 5. does NOT plac the application in condition for allowance because: Cahill et al (US 5,940,844), Mahmood (US 5,091,727), and Linstead et al (US 5,548,753) still meets the claimed invention.

Continuation of 10. Other: Claims 1-10 remains rejected as set forth in the Final Rejection (see paper NO. 8).